APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/598,595	08/17/2007	David Minodier	F40.12-0122	7469

27367   7590   08/03/2010
WESTMAN CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.
SUITE 1400
900 SECOND AVENUE SOUTH
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402

EXAMINER
JOHN, CLARENCE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2443	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
08/03/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/598,595	MINODIER ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	CLARENCE JOHN	2443	

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS,
WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>01 July 2010</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-13,15 and 16</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-13,15 and 16</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
        application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claims

This action is responsive to communication filed on July 1, 2010. Claims 1-13, 15-16 are pending.

Response to Remarks / Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed on 7/1/2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive and do not place the application in condition for allowance.

2. In response to the Applicant's arguments, the Examiner also states that Claims are to be given their broadest reasonable interpretation during prosecution, and the scope of a claim cannot be narrowed by reading disclosed limitations into the claim. *See In re Morris*, 127 F.3d 1048, 1054, 44 USPQ2D 1023, 1027 (Fed. Cir. 1997); In re Zletz, 893 F.2d 319, 321, 13 USPQ2D 1320, 1322 (Fed. Cir. 1989); *In re Prater*, 415 F.2d 1393, 1404, 162 USPQ 541,550 (CCPA 1969).

3. In addition, the law of anticipation does not require that a reference "teach" what an appellant's disclosure teaches. Assuming that reference is properly "prior art," it is only necessary that the claims "read on" something disclosed in the reference, i.e., all limitations of the claim are found in the reference, or "fully met" by it. *Kalman v. Kimberly-Clark Corp.*, 71 3 F.2d 760, 772, 21 8 USPQ 781,789 (Fed. Cir. 1983).

4. With respect to Claim 1, the Applicant argues that Weinstein does not teach determining the compatibility of software of the client with a predetermined access control protocol for access to the virtual network.

5. **In reply**, the Examiner states that Weinstein does teach the above limitation. (Page 2 – paragraph [0020] lines Figure 9, Page 3, paragraph [0021] lines 1-18, Page 6, paragraph [0069] lines 1-9, Page 12 – Claim 43). Weinstein teaches a wireless LAN which has high access data rate, local services demands of future Internet appliances. Weinstein also teaches creating a plurality of multiprotocol label switching paths to access points in a gateway router connected to a wireless network where plurality of virtual operators can have access. A computer software product enables a mobile user to get authenticated to the wireless network based on the software instructions to perform predetermined operations, sending messages from a mobile user to air access computer and obtaining subsequent codewords and user identification number. Thus Weinstein teaches the compatibility of software of the client with the access control protocol to the virtual network.

6. With respect to Claim 1, the Applicant also argues that Chang does not teach if the software of the client is not compatible, data transfer is authorized between

the client and at least one subscription system for subscribing to one service

provider.

7. **In reply**, the Examiner states that Chang was never relied upon authorizing data

transfer between the client and at least one subscription system. Chang was

relied upon incompatible software of the client only.   Change teaches a system

and method for incompatible user interfaces and access protocols (See Abstract,

Page 1, paragraph [0005] lines 8-11, Page 3, paragraph [0028], lines 1-5).

8. However Chang was never relied upon authorizing data transfer between the

client and at least one subscription system for subscribing to one service

provider. Stephenson was relied upon such limitation. Stephenson teaches a

system and method of data communication between server and clients and

implements exchange of data between the client enabled applications that are

connected to separate private networks and a public Internet. (Page 3, paragraph

[0039], lines 1-11); if the non-compatible client subscribes to at least one service

provider via the authentication network, (Page 4, paragraph [0060], Page 7,

paragraph [0109]. Here the client software compatibility is verified. If the software

is not compatible, the connection is broken); transferring to the non-compatible

client an authentication for accessing the virtual network which allows access to

the services of the service provider to which the non-compatible client is

subscribed and information which makes it possible to make the software of the

client compatible with the predetermined access control protocol. (Page 2,

paragraph [0034], Page 9, paragraph [0138]. Here the server allows highly

secure bi-directional communication between private network and virtual network

without modifying the firewall);

9. Weinstein and Chang have common grounds of have common grounds of client

server communication, accessing and exchanging data resources involving

access protocols and software compatibility. According to the Supreme Court

Decision in **KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc**., 550 U.S. -, 82 USPQ2d

1385 (2007), it would have been obvious to combine the use of known technique

which Chang teaches in the same way with Weinstein by implementing a

content management system in order to access and share additional non

compatible repositories.

10. Weinstein, Chang and Stephenson have common grounds of client server

communication, accessing and exchanging data resources involving access

protocols with software compatibility. According to the Supreme Court Decision in

KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc., 550 U.S. -, 82 USPQ2d 1385 (2007), it

would have been obvious to combine the use of known technique which

Stephenson teaches with Weinstein and Chang so that clients can use the same

type of access protocols to access resources from the server and need not

require separate translation of implemented protocols.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented
> and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time
> the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter
> pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. Claims 1, 2 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by

Weinstein et al (US 2002/0191572) in view of Chang et al. (US 2004/0215635) in

further view of Stephenson et al. (US 2002/0023143).

12. With respect to Claim 1, Weinstein teaches a method of authenticating a

telecommunication terminal called client for access to at least one virtual network

that allows the client to access the services of at least one service provider, the

or each virtual network being set up on a telecommunication network, the method

being performed with a data processing arrangement and comprising:

determining if a software of the client and a predetermined access control

protocol for access to the virtual network are compatible (Figure 9, Page 3,

paragraph [0021] lines 1-18, Page 6, paragraph [0069] lines 1-9).

13. Weinstein teaches the limitations of Claim 1 as stated above., However,

Weinstein does not explicitly state about the software of the client and

predetermined access control protocol are not compatible, authorizing data

transfer between the client and at least one subscription system for subscribing

the client to at least one service provider via an authentication network which is

different from the or each virtual network that allows the client to access the services of the or each service provider.

14. Conversely Chang does in fact teach such a limitation. Change teaches a system and method for incompatible user interfaces and access protocols (See Abstract, Page 1, paragraph [0005] lines 8-11, Page 3, paragraph [0028], lines 1-5).

15. Weinstein and Chang have common grounds of client server communication, accessing and exchanging data resources involving access protocols and software compatibility. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Chang with Weinstein by implementing a content management system in order to access and share additional non compatible repositories.

16. Weinstein and Chang teach the limitations of Claim 1 as described above. However Weinstein and Change do not explicitly state about authorizing data transfer between the client and at least one subscription system for subscribing the client to at least one service provider via an authentication network which is different from the or each virtual network that allows the client to access the services of the or each service provider.

17. Conversely, Stephenson does in fact teach such a limitation. Stephenson teaches a system and method of data communication between server and clients and implements exchange of data between the client enabled applications that are connected to separate private networks and a public Internet. (Page 3, paragraph [0039], lines 1-11); if the non-compatible client subscribes to at least

one service provider via the authentication network, (Page 4, paragraph [0060],

Page 7, paragraph [0109]. Here the client software compatibility is verified. If the

software is not compatible, the connection is broken); transferring to the non-

compatible client an authentication for accessing the virtual network which allows

access to the services of the service provider to which the non-compatible client

is subscribed and information which makes it possible to make the software of

the client compatible with the predetermined access control protocol. (Page 2,

paragraph [0034], Page 9, paragraph [0138], Here the server allows highly

secure bi-directional communication between private network and virtual network

without modifying the firewall);

18. Weinstein, Chang and Stephenson have common grounds of client server

communication, accessing and exchanging data resources involving access

protocols with software compatibility. It would have been obvious to a person of

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the

teachings of Stephenson with Weinstein and Chang so that clients can use the

same type of access protocols to access resources from the server and need not

require separate translation of implemented protocols.

19. With respect to Claim 2, Weinstein, Chang and Stephenson teach a method

according to Claim 1 wherein the authentication network is a virtual network or a

network that is separate from the telecommunication network. (Weinstein's

teachings on Page 5, paragraph [0055] and [0056]. Figure 3A. Here the virtual

operator network is different from mobile network).

20. With respect to Claim 11, Weinstein teaches a system for authenticating a

telecommunication terminal called client for access to at least one virtual network

for allowing the client to access the services of at least one service provider, the

or each virtual network being set up on a telecommunication network, the system

comprising ; processing means for determining if a software of the client and a

predetermined access control protocol for access to the telecommunication

network are compatible, (Figure 9, Page 3, paragraph [0021] lines 1-18, Page 6,

paragraph [0069] lines 1-9);

21. Weinstein teaches the limitations of Claim 11 as stated above., However,

Weinstein does not explicitly state about the software of the client which is not

compatible with the predetermined access control protocol, authorizing means for

authorizing if the software of the client and predetermined access control

protocol are not compatible, data transfer between the client and at least one

subscribing means for subscribing the client to at least one service provider via

an authentication network which is different from the or each virtual network

which allows the client to access the services of the or each service provider.

22. Conversely Chang does in fact teach such a limitation. Change teaches a system

and method for incompatible user interfaces and access protocols (See Abstract,

Page 1, paragraph [0005] lines 8-11, Page 3, paragraph [0028], lines 1-5).

23. Weinstein and Chang have common grounds of client server communication, accessing and exchanging data resources involving access protocols and software compatibility. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Chang with Weinstein by implementing a content management system in order to access and share additional non compatible repositories.

24. Weinstein and Chang teach the limitations of Claim 11 as described above. However Weinstein and Change do not explicitly state about authorization means for authorizing if the software of the client is not compatible with the predetermined access control protocol, data transfer between the client and at least one subscribing means for subscribing the client to at least one service provider via an authentication network which is different from the or each virtual network which allows the client to access the services of the or each service provider.

25. Conversely, Stephenson does in fact teach such a limitation. Stephenson teaches a system and method of data communication between server and clients and implements exchange of data between the client enabled applications that are connected to separate private networks and a public Internet. (Page 3, paragraph [0039], lines 1-11); if the non-compatible client subscribes to at least one service provider via the authentication network, (Page 4, paragraph [0060], Page 7, paragraph [0109]. Here the client software compatibility is verified. If the software is not compatible, the connection is broken); transfer means for

transferring to the non-compatible client an authentication for accessing the

virtual network which allows access to the services of the service provider to

which the non-compatible client is subscribed and information which makes it

possible to make the software of the client compatible with the predetermined

access control protocol. (Page 2, paragraph [0034], Page 9, paragraph [0138],

Here the server allows highly secure bi-directional communication between

private network and virtual network without modifying the firewall);

26. Weinstein, Chang and Stephenson have common grounds of client server

communication, accessing and exchanging data resources involving access

protocols with software compatibility. It would have been obvious to a person of

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the

teachings of Stephenson with Weinstein and Chang so that clients can use the

same type of access protocols to access resources from the server and need not

require separate translation of implemented protocols.

27. Claims 3-9, 12, 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Weinstein, Chang and Stephenson in further view of Prasad et

al. (US 7,197,125).

28. With respect to Claim 3, Weinstein, Chang and Stephenson teach the limitations

of Claim 1 as described above. However, Weinstein, Chang and Stephenson do

not explicitly state wherein the subscription system includes of at least one

subscription portal, (Figure 1, block 104) an authentication material server

(Figure 1, block 106) and, where-in response to the client subscribing subscribes
to a service, (Figure 2A, block 2-009); the subscription portal transfers to an
authentication server data associated with the authentication transferred to the
client. (Figure 2A - blocks 2-001 to 2-004 and Figure 2B - block 2-015).

29. Conversely Prasad does in fact teach such a limitation. Prasad teaches a method
for modifying a subscription of a subscriber to a telecommunication service in a
communication network with access protocols, authenticating and authorizing
users to access resources via a communication network. Prasad also teaches in
the subscription system which includes of at least one subscription portal, (Figure
1, block 104) an authentication material server (Figure 1, block 106) and, where-
in response to the client subscribing subscribes to a service, (Figure 2A, block 2-
009); the subscription portal transfers to an authentication server data associated
with the authentication transferred to the client. (Figure 2A - blocks 2-001 to 2-
004 and Figure 2B - block 2-015).

30. Weinstein, Chang and Stephenson have common grounds of client server
communication, accessing and exchanging data resources involving access
protocols with software compatibility. Prasad also teaches client server
communication with access protocols and accessing and sharing resources.

31. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the
invention was made to have combined the teachings of Prasad with Weinstein,
Chang and Stephenson by implementing an improved service selection and

management system which provides authentication functions to users regardless
of any service they subscribe to.

32. With respect to Claim 4, Weinstein, Chang, Stephenson and Prasad teach the
limitations of Claim 3 as described above. However, Weinstein, Chang and
Stephenson do not explicitly state wherein the client is connected to the network
via a Digital Subscriber Line Access Multiplexor performing the steps of
obtaining an identifier and a client authentication confirmation fom the
authentication server.

33. Conversely Prasad does in fact teach such a limitation. Prasad teaches wherein
the client is connected to the network via a Digital Subscriber Line Access
Multiplexor (Column 18, lines 24-29, Figure 7- block 718) and, if the client is
compatible with the predetermined access control protocol the Digital Subscriber
Line Access Multiplexer performs-the steps of obtaining an identifier and a client
authentication material (Column 17, lines 5-11, Column 8, lines 49-55. Figure 2A
block 2006. Here the command selections to the processor include the steps of
obtaining a username and authentication quality) and of obtaining a client
authentication confirmation from the authentication server (Column 8, lines 11-17
and Figure 2A, blocks 2-003 and 2-004).

34. Weinstein, Chang and Stephenson have common grounds of client server
communication, accessing and exchanging data resources involving access

protocols with software compatibility. Prasad also teaches client server

communication with access protocols and accessing and sharing resources.

35. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to have combined the teachings of Prasad with Weinstein,

Chang and Stephenson by implementing an improved service selection and

management system which provides authentication functions to users regardless

of any service they subscribe to.

36. With respect to Claim 5, Weinstein, Chang, Stephenson and Prasad teach the

limitations of Claim 4 as described above. However, Weinstein, Stephenson and

Prasad do not explicitly state if the authentication server does not confirm the

authentication of the client, the method comprises a step of authorizing data

transfer between the client and at least one subscription system for subscribing

the client to at least one service provider via an authentication network which is

different from the or each virtual network which allows the client to access the

services of the or each service provider.

37. Conversely Chang does in fact teach such a limitation. Change teaches a system

and method for incompatible user interfaces and access protocols (See Abstract,

Page 1, paragraph [0005] lines 8-11, Page 3, paragraph [0028], lines 1-5).

38. Weinstein, Stephenson, Prasad and Chang have common grounds of client

server communication, accessing and exchanging data resources involving

access protocols and software compatibility. It would have been obvious to a

person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have

combined the teachings of Chang with Weinstein by implementing a content

management system in order to access and share additional non compatible

repositories.

39. With respect to Claim 6, Weinstein, Chang and Stephenson teach the limitations

of Claim 3 as described above. However, Weinstein, Chang and Stephenson do

not explicitly state a method according to Claim 3, wherein there is a transfer to

the authentication server of information associated with the service provider to

which the client is subscribed and/or information characterizing the service to

which the client is subscribed.

40. Conversely Prasad does in fact teach such a limitation. Prasad teaches a method

for modifying a subscription of a subscriber to a telecommunication service in a

communication network with access protocols, authenticating and authorizing

users to access resources via a communication network.   Prasad also teaches

about a transfer to the authentication server of information associated with the

service provider to which the client is subscribed and/or information

characterizing the service to which the client is subscribed.

41. (Prasad - Column 10, lines 4 – 29, Fig 2B - blocks 2-014 through 2-017. This

shows the information to which the client is subscribed).

42. Weinstein, Chang and Stephenson have common grounds of client server

communication, accessing and exchanging data resources involving access

protocols with software compatibility. Prasad also teaches client server

communication with access protocols and accessing and sharing resources.

43. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to have combined the teachings of Prasad with Weinstein,

Chang and Stephenson by implementing an improved service selection and

management system which provides authentication functions to users regardless

of any service they subscribe to.

44. With respect to Claim 7, Weinstein, Chang, Stephenson and Prasad teach the

limitations of Claim 6 as described above. However, Weinstein, Chang and

Stephenson do not explicitly state wherein the authentication server additionally

transfers to the Digital Subscriber Line Access Multiplexer the information,

associated with the service provider to which the client is a client and/or the

information relating to the service or services to which the client is subscribed.

45. Conversely Prasad does in fact teach such a limitation. Prasad teaches a method

for modifying a subscription of a subscriber to a telecommunication service in a

communication network with access protocols, authenticating and authorizing

users to access resources via a communication network.   Prasad also teaches

about an authentication server additionally transfers to the Digital Subscriber Line

Access Multiplexer the information, associated with the service provider to which

the client is a client and/or the information relating to the service or services to

which the client is subscribed. (Prasad's teachings on Figure 2A blocks 2-006

through 2-011 and Figure 2B blocks 2-012 through 2-017 and Figure 4A blocks 4-007 through 4-009. Here the authentication server transfers all information to the service provider to which the client is subscribed).

46. Weinstein, Chang and Stephenson have common grounds of client server communication, accessing and exchanging data resources involving access protocols with software compatibility. Prasad also teaches client server communication with access protocols and accessing and sharing resources.

47. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Prasad with Weinstein, Chang and Stephenson by implementing an improved service selection and management system which provides authentication functions to users regardless of any service they subscribe to.

48. With respect to Claim 8, Weinstein, Chang, Stephenson and Prasad teach the limitations of Claim 7 as described above. However, Weinstein, Chang and Stephenson do not explicitly state about the Digital Subscriber Line Access Multiplexer authorizes data transfer between the virtual network which allows the client to access the services of the service provider.

49. Conversely Prasad does in fact teach such a limitation. Prasad teaches a method for modifying a subscription of a subscriber to a telecommunication service in a communication network with access protocols, authenticating and authorizing users to access resources via a communication network. Prasad also teaches

the Digital Subscriber Line Access Multiplexer authorizes data transfer between

the virtual network which allows the client to access the services of the service

provider. (Prasad's teachings on Figure 4A, blocks 4-004 and 4-011. Here the

client's data is transferred to the service provider for the client to access the

services to which the client is subscribed according to the communication speeds

to which the client is subscribed).

50. Weinstein, Chang and Stephenson have common grounds of client server

communication, accessing and exchanging data resources involving access

protocols with software compatibility. Prasad also teaches client server

communication with access protocols and accessing and sharing resources.

51. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to have combined the teachings of Prasad with Weinstein,

Chang and Stephenson by implementing an improved service selection and

management system which provides authentication functions to users regardless

of any service they subscribe to.

52. With respect to Claim 9, Weinstein, Chang and Stephenson teach the limitations

of Claim 1 as described above. However, Weinstein, Chang and Stephenson do

not explicitly state wherein an address server is also associated with the virtual

authentication network.

53. Conversely Prasad does in fact teach such a limitation. Prasad teaches a method

for modifying a subscription of a subscriber to a telecommunication service in a

communication network with access protocols, authenticating and authorizing

users to access resources via a communication network. Prasad also teaches

wherein an address server is also associated with the virtual authentication

network. (Column 19, lines 60-61, Column 20,, lines 31-34);   and the address

server allocates an address to the client for data transfer on the virtual

authentication network. (Column 7, lines 16-18).

54. Weinstein, Chang and Stephenson have common grounds of client server

communication, accessing and exchanging data resources involving access

protocols with software compatibility. Prasad also teaches client server

communication with access protocols and accessing and sharing resources.

55. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to have combined the teachings of Prasad with Weinstein,

Chang and Stephenson by implementing an improved service selection and

management system which provides authentication functions to users regardless

of any service they subscribe to.

56. With respect to Claim 12, Weinstein teaches a computer memory having stored

thereon a computer program including instructions which when run by a

computer perform a method of authenticating a telecommunication terminal,

called client, for access to at least one virtual network that allows the client to

access the services of at least one service provider, the or each virtual network

being set up on a telecommunication network, the method comprising:

determining if a software of the client and a predetermined access control
protocol for access to the virtual network are compatible (Figure 9, Page 3,
paragraph [0021] lines 1-18, Page 6, paragraph [0069] lines 1-9).

57. Weinstein teaches the limitations of Claim 1 as stated above., However,
Weinstein does not explicitly state about the software of the client and
predetermined access control protocol are not compatible, authorizing data
transfer between the client and at least one subscription system for subscribing
the client to at least one service provider via an authentication network which is
different from the or each virtual network that allows the client to access the
services of the or each service provider.

58. Conversely Chang does in fact teach such a limitation. Change teaches a system
and method for incompatible user interfaces and access protocols (See Abstract,
Page 1, paragraph [0005] lines 8-11, Page 3, paragraph [0028], lines 1-5).

59. Weinstein and Chang have common grounds of client server communication,
accessing and exchanging data resources involving access protocols and
software compatibility. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in
the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of
Chang with Weinstein by implementing a content management system in order to
access and share additional non compatible repositories.

60. Weinstein and Chang teach the limitations of Claim 1 as described above.
However Weinstein and Change do not explicitly state about authorizing data
transfer between the client and at least one subscription system for subscribing

the client to at least one service provider via an authentication network which is
different from the or each virtual network that allows the client to access the
services of the or each service provider.

61. Conversely, Stephenson does in fact teach such a limitation. Stephenson
teaches a system and method of data communication between server and clients
and implements exchange of data between the client enabled applications that
are connected to separate private networks and a public Internet. (Page 3,
paragraph [0039], lines 1-11); if the non-compatible client subscribes to at least
one service provider via the authentication network, (Page 4, paragraph [0060],
Page 7, paragraph [0109]. Here the client software compatibility is verified. If the
software is not compatible, the connection is broken); transferring to the non-
compatible client an authentication for accessing the virtual network which allows
access to the services of the service provider to which the non-compatible client
is subscribed and information which makes it possible to make the software of
the client compatible with the predetermined access control protocol. (Page 2,
paragraph [0034], Page 9, paragraph [0138], Here the server allows highly
secure bi-directional communication between private network and virtual network
without modifying the firewall);

62. Weinstein, Chang and Stephenson have common grounds of client server
communication, accessing and exchanging data resources involving access
protocols with software compatibility. It would have been obvious to a person of
ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the

teachings of Stephenson with Weinstein and Chang so that clients can use the
same type of access protocols to access resources from the server and need not
require separate translation of implemented protocols.

63. Weinstein, Chang and Stephenson teach the limitations of Claim 12 as described
above. However, Weinstein, Chang and Stephenson do not explicitly state about
a computer readable memory having stored thereon a computer program
including instructions which when run by a computer perform a method of
authenticating a telecommunication terminal.

64. Conversely Prasad does in fact teach such a limitation. Prasad teaches a method
for modifying a subscription of a subscriber to a telecommunication service in a
communication network with access protocols, authenticating and authorizing
users to access resources via a communication network. Prasad also teaches
an apparatus which is implemented by programmed computers which inherently
are programmed by and further include computer readable media that store a
computer program to perform the instructions discussed below and a storage
device (Figure 7, block 710) having stored thereon a computer program
including instructions for enabling a computer to carry out the authentication
method according to of Claim 1. (Figure 2A- blocks 2-002 through 2-004).

65. Weinstein, Chang and Stephenson have common grounds of client server
communication, accessing and exchanging data resources involving access

protocols with software compatibility. Prasad also teaches client server

communication with access protocols and accessing and sharing resources.

66. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to have combined the teachings of Prasad with Weinstein,

Chang and Stephenson by implementing an improved service selection and

management system which provides authentication functions to users regardless

of any service they subscribe to.

67. With respect to Claim 15, Weinstein, Chang and Stephenson teach the

limitations of Claim 1 as described above. However, Weinstein, Chang and

Stephenson do not explicitly state wherein the method authenticates the client

to the services of plural service providers via plural virtual networks wherein if the

software of the client and predetermined access control protocol are not

compatible, authorizing data transfer between the client and plural subscription

systems for subscribing the client to plural service providers via the

authentication network that allows the client to access the services of each

service provider.

68. Conversely Prasad does in fact teach such a limitation. Prasad teaches a method

for modifying a subscription of a subscriber to a telecommunication service in a

communication network with access protocols, authenticating and authorizing

users to access resources via a communication network. Prasad also teaches

the method which authenticates the client to the services of plural service

providers via plural virtual networks (Figure 2A blocks 2-001 through 2-004,
Column 8, lines 1-23. Here the client is authenticated upon successful
verification); wherein if the software of the client is not compatible with the
predetermined access control protocol, authorizing data transfer between the
client and plural subscription systems for subscribing the client to plural service
providers via the authentication network which allows the client to access the
services of each service provider. (Column 2, lines 35-54. Column 18, lines 36-
42. Figure 5B. Figure 7 - ISP 726. Here, when the subscription of the client is
modified, the client is not compatible with the network and data is transferred to
the client by the authenticated network).

69. Weinstein, Chang and Stephenson have common grounds of client server
communication, accessing and exchanging data resources involving access
protocols with software compatibility. Prasad also teaches client server
communication with access protocols and accessing and sharing resources.

70. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the
invention was made to have combined the teachings of Prasad with Weinstein,
Chang and Stephenson by implementing an improved service selection and
management system which provides authentication functions to users regardless
of any service they subscribe to.

71. With respect to Claim 16 , Weinstein, Chang and Stephenson teach the
    limitations of Claim 11 as described above. However, Weinstein, Chang and
    Stephenson do not explicitly state the limitations as stated in Claim 16.

72. Conversely Prasad does in fact teach such limitations. Prasad teaches a method
    for modifying a subscription of a subscriber to a telecommunication service in a
    communication network with access protocols, authenticating and authorizing
    users to access resources via a communication network. Prasad also teaches
    wherein the system is arranged for accessing plural virtual networks for allowing
    the client to access plural service providers and each virtual network is set up on
    the telecommunication network, (Prasad - Figure 2A, blocks 2-008 through2-011,
    Figure 2B, blocks 2-012 through 2-014); wherein: (a) the authorization means is
    arranged for subscription systems, (Prasad - Figure 5B. Here the user
    credentials are verified in order to access subscription systems); (b) the
    subscribing means is arranged for subscribing plural service providers via the
    network, (Prasad - Figure 2A blocks 2-001 through 2-004, Column 8, lines 1-23.
    Here the client who has subscribed to access service providers are
    authenticated upon successful verification of their credentials) and (c) the
    transfer means is arranged for transferring to the new compatible client, if the
    non-compatible client subscribes to plural service providers. (Prasad - Column 5,
    lines 59-67, Column 6, lines 1-2. Figure 1, Block 114. Here the non compatible
    client is authenticated to use the services of the service provider).

73. Weinstein, Chang and Stephenson have common grounds of client server communication, accessing and exchanging data resources involving access protocols with software compatibility. Prasad also teaches client server communication with access protocols and accessing and sharing resources.

74. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Prasad with Weinstein, Chang and Stephenson by implementing an improved service selection and management system which provides authentication functions to users regardless of any service they subscribe to.

75. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weinstein, Chang and Stephenson in further view of Addington et al. (US 7,194,756).

76. With respect to Claim 10, Weinstein, Chang and Stephenson teach the limitations of Claim 1 as described above. However Weinstein, Chang and Stephenson do not explicitly state about teaching a method according to Claim 1, wherein the telecommunication network is a high-speed network based on Ethernet technology, and wherein the predetermined access control protocol is a protocol of the IEEE 802.1x type, and the clients are connected to the Digital Subscriber Line Access Multiplexer via connections of the DSL type.

77. Conversely, Addington teaches such a limitation where the telecommunication network which he uses is a high speed network based on Ethernet technology, (Column 55, lines 61-67) and the predetermined access control protocol is a protocol of the IEEE 802.11b (Column 56, lines 1-4 and Figure 22, block 1556).

78. Weinstein, Chang and Stephenson have common grounds of client server communication, accessing and exchanging data resources involving access protocols with software compatibility. Addington teaches digital communication network involving subscription services using IP Protocol. All references teach communication networks using IP Protocols.

79. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Addington with Weinstein, Chang and Stephenson in order to have high speed wireless data access from the network to the user's computer. (Addington's teachings on Column 55, lines 61-67 and Column 56, lines 1-4).

80. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Prasad in view of Addington.

81. With respect to Claim 13, Prasad teaches a Digital Subscriber Line Access Multiplexor which allows at least one client to access the services of at least one service provider, (Prasad's teachings on Figure 4A, block 4-001 through 4-004); the client line multiplexor being arranged for relaying the information transmitted by the client and associated with authentication of the client to an authentication

server, (Prasad's teachings on Figure 2B, block 2-017, Figure 4A, blocks 4-004

and 4-005. Here the information of the client is relayed to the authentication

server)

82. Prasad teaches the limitations of Claim 13 as described above. However Prasad

does not explicitly state about the digital subscriber line access multiplexer

including a software module according to the IEEE 802.1x standard.

83. Conversely, Addington teaches such a limitation in his telecommunication

network which uses a high speed network based on Ethernet technology

(Addington's teachings on Column 55, lines 61-67) and the client line multiplexor

includes a software module (Column 30, lines 5-6) according to the protocol

which is IEEE 802.11b.

84. Addington teaches digital communication network involving subscription

services using IP Protocol. Prasad also teaches a telecommunications network

involving subscription services using IP Protocol. Both references teach

communication networks using IP Protocols.

85. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at

the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Addington

with Prasad in order to have enhanced services such as Personal Video

Recording (PVR) from the service provider and configuring the service in the

host. (Addington's teachings on Column 30, lines 5-10).

Conclusion

The above rejections are based upon the broadest reasonable interpretation of the claims. Applicant is advised that the specified citations of the relied upon prior art, in the above rejections, are only representative of the teachings of the prior art, and that any other supportive sections within the entirety of the reference (including any figures, incorporation by references, claims and /or priority documents) is implied as being applied to teach the scope of the claims.

Applicant may not introduce any new matter to the claims or to the specification. For any subsequent response that contains new/amended claims, Applicant is required to cite its corresponding support in the specification.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CLARENCE JOHN whose telephone number is

(571)270-5937. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Fri 8:00 am to 5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ms. Tonia Dollinger can be reached on 571-272-4170. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/CJ/
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2443
7/29/2010

/Tonia LM Dollinger/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2443